**Evaluation and recommended ranking of the applicants for the position as Research fellow (PhD) in ………………….
Department of ………….., University of Bergen**

This 4-year position as Research fellow (PhD candidate) in the ………….. research group was announced with an application deadline ……………………….. The position is financed by the University of Bergen. Alternativt: The position is affiliated to the research project “……………………..…..”, funded by the ……………….. programme from the Research Council of Norway/other source(s).

**The applicants**

The position attracted …… applicants:

Navneliste, generert fra Jobbadmin – enten i alfabetisk rekkefølge eller etter ID
(tips: hvis svært mange søkere, lim navnelisten inn i en tabell med 2–3 kolonner)

1. NN
2. NN
3. NN
4. NN

**The evaluation committee**

On dd.mm.åååå the Head of Department appointed a committee to evaluate the applications consisting of:

* **First name Surname,** title, Department of ………………, University of Bergen (chair)
* **First name Surname**, title, Department of ………………, University of Bergen
* Eventuelt **First name Surname**, title, Department of ………………, …..

**Required qualifications for the position including personal qualities**

The committee has evaluated the applicants in accordance with the requirements listed in the advertisement text:

(siter fra utlysningsteksten)

All the applicants have been asked to include in their application (i) research interests, (ii) the names and contact details of at least two referees, (iii) copies of diplomas/transcripts and relevant certificates, (iv) curriculum vitae, (v) a list of any works of a scientific nature and (vi) copies of scientific publications, if any. (Kontroller at denne opplistingen stemmer med utlysningsteksten.)

**Evaluation of the applicants**

The evaluation committee initially selected the candidates who seemed to fulfil the requirements listed in the advertisement text. These candidates were further evaluated with respect to how well they cover the area of expertise sought after and whether they have the specific skills required, based on the provided material. Furthermore, we have evaluated the candidates’ motivation for applying, their research interests and how well this position would fit into their career plans judged from the application letter.

Based on the given criteria the candidates were divided into three groups:

1. **Candidates who failed to demonstrate** in their application that they fulfil one or more of the requirements for the position (relevant MSc, background that gives good understanding of the research topic, [other essential competence] and/or did not provide all the material required for the assessment (see above). The following candidates therefore were not considered further (applicant number in brackets):
First name Surname (applicant number), First name Surname (applicant number), etc……
2. **Formally competent candidates who also fulfill all *requirements* in the announcement,** but who fell short of the top candidates on one or more criteria, and are therefore not considered further:
First name Surname (applicant number), fell short on the following criteria…

First name Surname (applicant number), fell short on the following criteria…

etc……

1. **The top candidates**First name Surname (applicant number), First name Surname (applicant number), etc……

**A summary of the top candidates (in alphabetic order) is given below:**

**First name Surname** (…. years old)

The applicant obtained a Bachelor in ……….. at the University of ………….. in yyyy. He/she has a Master in …………… from the University of ………….. in yyyy.

He/She also stayed abroad at the Institute of ………., …………. (town), ………… (country). [other working experience]. He/She has good knowledge and skills in …………….. (subject area and relevant methods). He/She is the first author of one scientific article published in …………….in yyyy.

He/She is [highly] [well] qualified for the PhD position.

**First name Surname** (…. years old)

The applicant obtained a Bachelor in ……….. at the University of ……………. in yyyy, and a Master in …………… at the University of ………………. in yyyy. He/She has published one scientific article from a research project undertaken during his/her Bachelor in …………….in yyyy. The candidate has experience in …………………. He/she also has experience of teaching at the Department of ……….., University of ……………...

He/She is [highly] [well] qualified for the PhD position.

Etc………………..

NB! Interviews can only be performed after the evaluation committee has received confirmation that the ranked candidates meet the criteria for admission to the PhD program. This confirmation will also include information about whether any of the candidates need to document that he/she fulfills the [faculty’s English language requirements](https://www.uib.no/en/matnat/52899/admission-doctoral-education-faculty-mathematics-and-natural-sciences#english-language-requirements-for-phd-admission). Failure to produce such documentation should not exclude a candidate (and the candidate will be required to submit this at a later date). However, it is the committee’s responsibility to evaluate the candidates’ English skills during the interviews in relation to the language requirements in the announcement. The HR-consultant must be informed about the preliminary ranking. Obtaining the confirmation normally takes 1-2 days.

**Ranking of top candidates**

Based on the above, the candidates First name Surname (applicant number), First name Surename (applicant number), … and … were summoned to interviews. The interviews were conducted over Skype/at the department. The Head of Department/The Research Group Leader/The Project Leader was present at the interviews. The committee has also contacted referees.

**Interview notes** (motivation, presentation and communications skills / language and other skills / personal fitness)

**Note:** Interview notes, referee reports and the comparison are exempted from public disclosure and will therefore not be sent to the candidates. In case of a formal complaint, the candidate complaining will be entitled to read the interview notes concerning him/her.

**First name Surname**

……………………………

**First name Surname**

……………………………

**First name Surname**

……………………………

**Referee reports** (References’ names are not part of the report)

**First name Surname**

……………………………

**First name Surname**

……………………………

**First name Surname**

……………………………

**Comparison of top candidates**

………………………………………….

**Conclusion and recommended ranking**

*The conclusion should compare how the qualified candidates level up to each other, and the discussion should be clear in leading to the conclusion and final ranking of the top candidates.*

*Please remember that*

1. *at least three candidates should be ranked,* ***if*** *three candidates are found to be qualified*
2. *if fewer than three candidates has been ranked, the committee should consider if any of the candidates in group 2 (that is, the candidates who fulfill* ***all the required qualifications****) should be invited for an interview.*
3. *candidates who are* ***not*** *qualified must not be ranked.*

Based on all credentials, references and interviews the committee recommends the following ranking:

1. First name Surname
2. First name Surname
3. First name Surname

31 March 2020

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Signature | Signature | Eventuelt Signature |
| First name SurnameJob titleUiB | First name SurnameJob titleUiB | First name SurnameJob titleOrganization |